REMARKS

Claims 1-31 and 33-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 18, 29, 31, and 33 are independent. Claim 31 has been canceled and claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 33-36 are allowed.

Claims 1-30, 37, and 38 stand rejected und 35 U.S.C. §101 for being "software per se".

On September 3, 2008, the undersigned sent a proposed amendment to the Examiner by email. The Examiner presented the amendment to his SPE for review and the SPE presented it to their "101 expert". As stated in the Examiner's emails of September 5 and September 10, the proposed amendment overcomes all of the §101 rejections. This amendment incorporates the amendments made in the proposed amendment.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Embley. Claim 31 has been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-3 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Oracle in view of Collis, further in view of Embley.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Oracle teaches a collection of software tools (see §Creating OLAP Web Sites, "A Developer's Toolkit, provided with the Express Web Agent...". The Examiner interprets a "Developer's Toolkit" to be a collection of software tools.) The tools are embodied on a computer readable medium. According to the Examiner, the tools are "for acquiring data from diverse sources and/or structuring the data and/or determining similarity of content for the purpose of product information management."

Oracle does teach a "collection of software tools". However, the Oracle Express Web Agent Toolset is designed to create dynamic web pages from structured databases. It teaches nothing about creating structured views of unstructured web data. Claim 1 is directed to quite the opposite of what Oracle teaches. As such, Oracle teaches away from claim 1. The Java Graphs, Java Tables, and HTML tables shown in Oracle do not structure data from diverse sources, they only restructure data from already structured databases.

The Examiner admits that Oracle does not teach any of the rest of claim 1 and cites Collis for teaching a web agent creator, a web agent, and a web agent manager.

Collins shows a collection of tools but nowhere requires using more than one of these tools. Claim 1 has been amended to require acquiring <u>unstructured</u> data from diverse sources and/or structuring the data.

Although Collins uses the word "agent", Collins, like Oracle, is not concerned with "web agents" as that term is used in the instant application, i.e. software designed to mine data from web pages, also sometimes known as a "web crawler", a "web robot" or a "bot". See pages 5, 27-28, and 30-33 of the instant specification. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to state that the web agent has "means for acquiring product information from the world wide web".

The Examiner states that he has interpreted "resources required by the plan" (p. 11 of Collis) as being "products" as that word is used in claim 1. This is not a fair interpretation. Collis defines these resources as facts contained in an agent's resource database. Collis does not teach or suggest that these resources be acquired by the agent from the world wide web. See the sixth bullet on p. 11 of Collis which is reproduced below.

> "[A] Resource Database that maintains a list of resources (referred to in this paper as *facts)* that are owned by and available to the agent. The Resource Database also supports a direct interface to external systems, which allows it to dynamically link to and utilise [sic] proprietary databases."

See also Figure 3.2 on page 10 of Collis and the description above the Figure which states in part "an application-independent generic ZEUS agent that can be customised [sic] for specific applications by ***imbuing it with problem-specific resources,…***". [Emphasis added.] In other words, the agent is provided with the resources before it goes to work. The claimed web agent's job is to crawl the web and collect product information.

16

Collis discloses a toolset for constructing a set of communicating agents that talk to each other. The architecture for a ZEUS agent shown in Figure 3.2 indicates that a ZEUS agent receives input only from other ZEUS agents through incoming messages and facts from a structured external database. There is no mention of receiving input from the web. Therefore, a ZEUS agent is not a web agent and the co-ordination Engine is not a web agent manager.

The Examiner admits that neither Oracle nor Collis teach or suggest an ontology-directed classifier, an ontology-directed extractor, or an ontology-directed matcher, and cites Embley for these components.

With regard to the ontology-directed classifier, Embley describes a process for extraction of properties from a product description based on an ontology that defines the nature of those properties. The example shows a car advertisement which can be considered an unstructured product description of a car, (a class in the ontology shown in Figure 2). The keyword proximity process described by Embley is a method for recognizing the properties of a car in that description. Embley teaches nothing about how to recognize that the car advertisement is a description referring to the car class. It needs to be told this by the system user. The ontology-directed classifier according to amended claim 1 includes "means for classifying product information". See pages 6, 46-53, and Fig. 9 of the instant specification. In contrast to the example given by Embley, the

17

claimed invention is able to automatically recognize that the car advertisement is a description referring to the car class.

Claims 4-16, 18-30, 37 and 38 are free of the art. Claim 4 has been amended to independent form including the amendments to claim 1 which overcomes the §101 rejection. Since independent claim 31 has been canceled, there is no additional fee for making claim 4 independent. Thus, claims 4-16 are allowable. Independent claims 18 and 29 have been amended to overcome the §101 rejection and, thus, claims 18-30 are allowable.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas A Gallagher/

Thomas A. Gallagher
Reg. No. 31358
Attorney for Applicant(s)

60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
(203) 329-9898

October 1, 2008